UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,399	06/20/2003	Tim Regan	MSFT121084	7006

26389 7590 11/09/2006

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
PURCELL, IAN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/600,399	REGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ian M. Purcell	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/20/03.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2003 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/20/03.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 16 and 17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 16 and 17 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-8 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Benson et al. ("Benson", US # 5,808,610).

4. As per independent claim 1, Benson teaches a computer implemented method of positioning a graphical component in a display, the method comprising:

determining collinear lines for a first graphical component (fig. 5, *docking wedge* 512);

detecting the movement of an edge of a second graphical component (column 1, lines 64-65);

determining when said edge of the second graphical component is moved within a predetermined distance of one of said collinear lines of said first graphical component (column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 8); and

automatically aligning said edge of said second graphical component with said one of said collinear lines of said first graphical component (column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 8).

Independent claims 16, 17 and 18 are individually similar in scope to independent claim 1 and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

5. As per claim 2, Benson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said first graphical component is a polygonal component (fig. 3, *panel* 214).

6. As per claim 3, Benson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said first graphical component has a shape selected from the group consisting of triangle, quadrilateral, pentagon, hexagon, septagon, octagon, nonagon, and decagon shapes (fig. 3, *panel* 214).

7. As per claim 4, Benson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein automatically moving said edge of said second graphical component comprises moving said first display component (column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 8).

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 4 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

8. As per claim 5, Benson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said second graphical component is resized (column 2, lines 5-9).

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 5 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

9. As per claim 6, Benson teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising receiving an indication to resize said first display component until said edge of said first display component is within said predetermined distance of one of said lines collinear to an edge of said second display component (column 2, lines 5-9).

10. As per claim 7, Benson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said predetermined distance is uniform along said collinear line (column 4, lines 4-6).

11. As per claim 8, Benson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said predetermined distance is gradated along said collinear line (column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 8).

12. As per claim 15, Benson teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving an indication to reposition said first display component until said edge of said first display is within said predetermined distance of one of said lines collinear to an edge of said second display component (column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson et al. ("Benson", US # 5,808,610) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Bloomquist et al. ("Bloomquist", US #6,480,813).

15. As per claim 9, Benson teaches the method of claim 8. However, Benson does not teach expressly the method wherein said gradated predetermined distance varies according to the proximity of said first graphical component to said second graphical component.

Bloomquist teaches a method wherein a gradated predetermined distance varies according to the proximity of said first graphical component to said second graphical component (fig. 8; and column 6, lines 6-14).

Benson and Bloomquist are analogous art because they are of the same field of endeavor, namely graphical user interfaces with snapping functions.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the snapping functionality of Bloomquist within Benson's method, in order to provide a more precise snapping function.

16. As per claim 10, the modified Benson, in view of Bloomquist, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said proximity is measured in pixels (Benson, column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 8).

17. As per claim 11, the modified Benson, in view of Bloomquist, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said proximity is measured in display regions (Bloomquist, fig. 7; and column 5, lines 59-66).

18. As per claim 12, the modified Benson, in view of Bloomquist, teaches the method of claim 1; wherein said predetermined distance varies according to a predefined relationship between said first graphical component and said second graphical component (fig. 8; and column 6, lines 6-14).

19. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson et al. ("Benson", US # 5,808,610) in view of Bloomquist et al. ("Bloomquist", US #6,480,813) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Santos-Gomez ("Santos-Gomez", US # 5,920,315).

20. As per claim 13, the modified Benson, in view of Bloomquist, teaches the method of claim 12. However, the modified Benson, in view of Bloomquist, does not teach expressly the method wherein said predetermined relationship is determined from the type of graphical components forming said first and second graphical components.

Santos-Gomez teaches a method wherein predetermined relationship is determined from the type of graphical components forming said first and second graphical components (column 4, lines 15-27).

Benson, Bloomquist and Santos-Gomez are analogous art because they are of the same field of endeavor, namely graphical user interfaces.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the functionality of Santos-Gomez within the modified Benson's method, in order to provide a more efficient graphical user interface.

21. As per claim 14, the modified Benson, in view of Bloomquist and Santos-Gomez, teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said predetermined relationship is determined from the contents of said first and said second graphical components (Santos-Gomez, column 4, lines 15-27).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian M. Purcell whose telephone number is (571) 272-5755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ian M. Purcell
Examiner

SY LUV
PRIMARY EXAMINER